

# Jamaica

CW/012/51

THE

# Watchman.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

AT THEIR OFFICE, IN



SPES MEA IN DILEXIT

E. JORDON AND R. OSBORN,

WATER-LANE, KINGSTON.

VOL. III.

SATURDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 17, 1832.

No. 92.

## HEBDOMADARY.

—ooo—

### NOVEMBER

Begins on THURSDAY, hath 30 Days.  
Full Moon—Thursday the 8th, at 23min. past 3 morn.  
Last Quarter—Wednesday the 14th, at 44m. past 10 even.  
New Moon—Thursday the 22d, at 10min. past 4 morn.  
First Quarter—Friday the 30th, at 50min. past 7 morn.

SUN enters SAGITTARIUS 22d day, at 17min. past 1 morn.

Days Month.	Days Week.	CALENDAR.			
		Sun rises and sets.	Equa. of time.	Moon's age.	Moon rises and sets.
16 Sund.	22d Sunday after Trin.	6 26 6 H	35 26 2	52	
19 Mon.	Mars on merid. at midnight	6 27 6 H	21 27 3	46	
20 Tues.	Edmund, King and Martyr	6 27 6 H	6 28 4	41	
21 Wed.	Im. 4th Sat. Jup. at Ob. 3m. morn.	6 27 6 13	51 29 5	35	
22 Thurs.	Cecilia	6 28 6 19	35 1	sets.	
23 Friday	St. Clement	6 28 6 17	18 2	6 4	.53
24 Sat.	Sun's decl. 20deg. 40min. S.	6 28 6 18	1 3 7	43	

King's-House, Nov. 9, 1832.

### MILITIA PROMOTIONS.

St. Elizabeth's Regiment.  
Oct. 15 Lieutenant C. P. Clement to be Captain  
Manchester Regiment.  
20 Ensign Matthew Ham to be Lieutenant  
Dianas Edwards, Gunner, to be Captain

mr. Townsend, mr. Walker, mr. Hyslop, mr. Frater, mr. Stamp, mr. Lowndes, mr. Jordan, mr. Leslie, and mr. Crawford—11.

Mr. Cox presented a petition from Lawrence Read Stephens, Esq. of St. Mary's, stating that he had sustained great grievance and oppression, in consequence of the conduct of Robert Cargill, Esq. and praying the aid of the House. The hon. member expressed his regret that a sense of duty compelled him to lay so unpleasant a document before the House, containing such serious charges against a public officer; and moved that it should be referred to the Committee of Grievances.

Mr. Townshend objected to its reception. He considered it neither fair nor just that such a petition should appear on their minutes. Mr. Stephens, and the hon. member, has his remedy; let him apply to the Court of Chancery.

Mr. Watkis wished to know why Mr. Stephens should be driven to the Court of Chancery when the grievance he complained of could be redressed by the House. He thought it but fair that the case should be enquired into, and decided upon agreeably to the facts which might appear in the course of that inquiry.

Mr. Panton regarded the matter as one which affected two private individuals. He did not see that it was of such importance as to engage the attention of the House.

Mr. Beaumont in a long speech advocated the right of the subject to petition, and ridiculed the idea that the petition ought to be rejected because it was from one individual against another. He alluded to the case of Col. Bradly, in the House of Commons, and urged the propriety of investigating the charges contained in Mr. Stephens' petition. After a few remarks from Mr. Hyslop, Mr. Cox, and Mr. King, the petition was referred to the Committee of Grievances, and Mr. Beaumont, Mr. Watkis, Mr. Hylton, Mr. Pantor, Mr. Batty, and Mr. King, added to it.

Mr. Frater presented a petition from the inhabitants of Trelawny, in favor of the Presbyterian Religion, which was read, and ordered to lie on the table. He also gave notice that he would the next day present a bill laying

The same hon. member presented a petition to the Health Officer at Falmouth, praying for extra pay, his fees not being commensurate with his services, which was rejected.

The Clerk of the Council brought down a message stating that their honours had given his Lordship the Bishop leave to attend the Committee to ascertain whether any, and what, obstruction had been offered to the religious instruction of the slaves.

Mr. Manderson presented petitions from five individuals in Cornwall, two of which were referred to Committee of Accounts, two to a Special Committee consisting of Mr. Manderson, Mr. Beaumont, and Mr. Robertson, and one to the martial-law Committee.

Mr. Mitchell presented sundry petitions, among them one from the Rev. Mr. Murphy, who states that he is educating a GREAT NUMBER of children, and praying the aid of the house, which was ordered to lie on the table.

The Deficiency Bill was committed, reported, and ordered to be engrossed.—Adjourned.

Thursday, Nov. 15.

Mr. Collman, the member for Clarendon, having appeared at the bar, was introduced by Mr. Turner, and took the oaths and his seat.

Engrossed deficiency bill read third time, and passed.

The clergy bill read second time.

Mr. Cox moved that it be committed at once.

Mr. Beaumont objected. He proposed Tuesday, which was agreed to.

Mr. Bernard presented a petition from Dr. Turner, physician to the county gaol of Middlesex, which was referred to the state of the island.

Mr. Manderson presented petitions from A. Holmes, J. Gaynor, and Richard Williams; the former referred to Committee of Accounts, and the latter to Martial Law Committee.

Mr. Frater presented a petition from W. Lemonious, Elkin Cooper, and William Morris, permanent police officers, who had never done any thing, but expected to be paid their salaries; which was rejected.

Mr. Shenton added to the committee to examine the Journals of the Council.

Mr. Cox presented a bill relative to the Ferry road which was read first time.

Mr. Watkis mentioned that he had received a letter from Mr. Campbell, the newly elected member for Kingston, stating that indisposition prevented his attending the House, and requesting leave of absence; which was granted.

Mr. Guy presented an insolvent debtor's bill, which, after some remarks from Mr. Beaumont and Mr. Bernard, was withdrawn, and a committee appointed to amend the present law.

Mr. Beaumont presented a petition from L. H. Evelyn, Esq. late Deputy Receiver General at Savanna la Mar, praying to be relieved from certain penalties which he had incurred while holding the office, which was ordered to lie on the table.

On motion that the bill regulating the practice in the Court of Ordinary be committed.

Mr. Bernard moved that it should be read that day three months.

Mr. Davis moved an amendment, that a committee be appointed to inquire and report on the practice of the Court of Ordinary, as it regards the granting of letters of administration.

Mr. Batty moved an amendment on the amendment, that

the Committee enquire into all means of reducing the expence in that court, and to bring a bill before the House be referred to such committee. The amendments were agreed to, and Mr. Watkis, Mr. Beaumont, Mr. Bernard, Mr. King, Mr. Guy, Mr. Davis, and Mr. Townshend appointed such committee.

Mr. Evelyn's petition taken up, read, and referred to a special committee.

Mr. Beaumont presented a bill to limit the privilege of the members of the House, and prevent fraudulent debtors obtaining a seat there. This bill was attacked tooth and nail; and, on motion of Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Frater, thrown out without a division.

Mr. Stamp presented a report from the Committee on Courts of Justice, recommending that a message should be sent to the Governor, requesting him to send down to the House the abstracts of all cases, which have been decided in the Court of Chancery.

Mr. Watkis presented a bill for the more easy recovery of small debts, which was received, read a first time, and ordered a second reading to-morrow.

House in Committee on bill to regulate the sale of Gunpowder and fire arms; House adjourned, progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

Mr. Mitchell presented a petition from John Foxles, Netham Tory, James M. Down, and Moses Delgado freeholders of this town, on behalf themselves and Barnaby Maddan, praying for a scrutiny, which being received and read, Mr. Mitchell moved that its prayer be taken into consideration on Thursday the 22d inst.

Mr. Beaumont objected to the shortness of the time, and moved that Tuesday the 27th inst. should be fixed for taking it into consideration, which was agreed to.

Ordered that the sitting member and the petitioner, B. Maddan, or their Agents, do appear at the bar on the 27th inst., and that the names of the persons to be objected to be delivered by the petitioner to the sitting member on or before the 27th inst., and vice versa.—Adjourned.

FRIDAY, Nov. 16.

Mr. Beaumont and Mr. Batty appointed Committee to consider the message of yesterday.

Mr. Beaumont complained of a breach of the privileges of the House, contained in the *Despatch*. The following is the paragraph alluded to. "Mr. Beaumont, with some asperity, asked how long it was since Mr. King had become regardful of private character. He could not discover what produced this new conviction upon his mind. He had seen him in the House indulging very freely indeed in animadversions upon private character. A law similar to the present had been introduced in the British Parliament, and he did not see why it should not be adopted in this house." The Hon. member appealed to the House whether he had ever uttered such remarks, and observed that Mr. Batty had also been made to talk nonsense. In future he would move that the libeller, whether a member of the House or not, be imprisoned in the common gaol during the whole Sessions, and not for three or four days.

The paragraph was voted a breach of the privileges of the House, being false.

Mr. Pantor presented a petition from Capt. Passley, praying to be remunerated for his services during the rebellion, which was referred to the martial-law Committee.

Mr. Frater presented a Bill laying a duty on Foreign stock.

Mr. Beaumont, Mr. Frater, Mr. Cox, Mr. Barclay, and Mr. Stamp, appointed a Committee to ascertain and report as to the most efficient means of colonizing the interior of the island with free labourers.

The same hon. member gave notice that he would, on an early day, move for the appointment of a Committee to ascertain and report whether any, and what means can be adopted for doing away with the existing disputes between us and the mother country.

Mr. Bernard moved that a short bill should be introduced re-enacting several of the annual bills.

The same hon. member presented a petition from the Governor's Secretary, praying payment of postages, which was referred to Committee of Accounts.

The Governor's Secretary brought down messages from his Excellency relating to the want of classification among the prisoners in Kingston Gaol, from the absence of accommodation. An account due to Lieut. Col. Paterson for boat hire to convey the Governor's Despatches from Fort Charles to Port Henderson—and in reply to the message from the House relative to abstracts stating that he could agree to their request, which were ordered to lie on the Table.

Mr. Stamp said when the evidence was published the Governor would see the necessity for putting the House in possession of the abstracts.

Mr. Cox presented a petition from the Clerk of the Vestry for St. Mary's praying to be paid for his trouble in receiving and filing the Registry Returns, which was referred to the Committee of Accounts.

Mr. Barclay moved that a Committee be appointed to ascertain and report the propriety of remitting the punishment of slaves who had been sentenced to confinement in the Workhouse for life which was agreed to. He also moved that the Supervisor of the several Workhouses furnish the House with the names of such convicts as merited its consideration.

Mr. Leslie gave notice that he would, on an early day, bring in a bill granting the usual Salary to the Chief Justice, Sir Joshua Rowle.

Mr. Beaumont presented a bill to consolidate and amend the several acts relative to the Ferry road.—Adjourned.

## THE JAMAICA WATCHMAN.

THE SITTING MAGISTRATES.  
The Sitting Magistrates for the ensuing week are—Al-  
derman Williams, and Common Councilmen Forsyth and  
Lenan.

### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"DONALD M'PHER" and "SEVERITAS" have been received, and shall be attended to.

## The Watchman;

KINGSTON, JAMAICA.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1832.

By the Mail Boat Lady Smith, we received Nassau papers to the 3d inst. but too late to enable us to lay any extracts from them before our readers in this day's impression. We shall, in our next, endeavour to make room for any thing interesting, which, upon a careful perusal, may be found in them. There is, however, one circumstance which we cannot avoid mentioning as we feel assured it will be gratifying to the majority of our readers, which is—that his Majesty, and Council, had dismissed the several Petitions from the Jamaica House of Assembly—The Inhabitants of New Providence, Abaco, Eleuthera, and Harbour Island, complaining of the conduct of Sir James C. Smyth, and praying for his removal. We don't know what the Argus will say to this, or those of the Bahamians who belong to his party. It will, however, prove a poser, as they were sanguine in their expectations of success.

### THE CLERGY BILL

We have been favoured with a sight of this bill, and a previous sample it is of the *politics* of Bishop Lipscomb, and of the trickery of his lawyer brother Mr. Henry! We have seen some queer things enacted into laws by our Jamaica Legislature certainly, but if this same bill of Mr. Henry Lipscomb shall pass the ordeal of its three branches, we shall then be indebted to it for about the most complete specimen of lying and partial legislation that can well be conceived. The bill professes, by its preamble, to seek the stability of the Established Church in this island, and to extend its usefulness among us; in doing which it is to provide for the better government of the Clergy, and for investing the Bishop with ecclesiastical authority over them. But what does it? 1st. It shaks that Church to its foundation; for once effect that all the people of God shall be driven from its communion, as by some of the tyrannical and soul-fettering clauses of this bill they are likely to be, and the example of the Papacy may teach us the result. 2d. It so binds in the trammels and meshes of Mr. Lipscomb's restrictions and beloved £5 6s. 8d. licenses, the exertions of the few Ministers of the Established Church among us who care for the souls of the people, and do not count the "cure of souls" simply as a temporal *benifice*, a "doing well to themselves"—that their usefulness, already shamefully circumscribed and limited, is altogether put an end to. 3d. Instead of providing an ecclesiastical code of regulations for the government of the Clergy, and investing the Bishop with ecclesiastical authority, it flies in the face of the Canons and Constitutions of the Church, and ~~does nothing more nor less than break the Bishop's~~ (according as we have heard) the colonel of a regiment, in which the Archdeacon, Rural Deans, and Chaplain are the field officers, the Rectors, captains and lieutenants, and the poor Curates (Island and Stipendiary,) sergeants, corporals, and lance corporals, amenable to regimental courts martial, to be degraded and turned into the ranks whenever they shall offend against the discipline of the regiment, or the whims of "their superior officers!" Such is Mr. Henry Lipscomb's bill—a bill which has, of course, been submitted to the Bishop for his approval before its introduction into the House! Reverend Father in God! what are we to say to you? What, think you, will be said to you for this bill in England? in the Colonial Office? in the House of Commons? But we need not go so far surely—what will not be said to you in our own House of Assembly, upon such propositions as are contained in the following clauses?—clauses which you have authorized, or at least permitted your lawyer brother to frame in "the Bishop's bill?"

The first clause we notice is that requiring the Curates to assist the Rectors, not only in the propagation of the Gospel, but "in the performance of all other ministerial duties amongst the slaves." Does his Lordship, or his brother, mean to confine this assistance to the districts of such Curates? Or is this clause intended, as we have heard, to meet the following case, and one or two others like it? It is well known that the Archdeacon of Jamaica has been made to take the living of Kingston, and that one of the Stipendiary Curates, (intended, when provided for by the British Parliament for the instruction of the slaves) has been given to him to perform his duties of Rector. Mr. Hill, the Bishop's Chaplain and prime minister, is this Curate, and receives, in addition to his Stipend from the Treasury, a very handsome remuneration for his performance of the Rector's surplice duties—(the emoluments of his two appointments, together, we have heard exceed £1,000 per annum)—but these duties somewhat interfere with his dancing attendances upon the Bishop and the Bishop's lady! To remove this inconvenience, sometime back, Mr. Hill, aided by the Bishop, and through him, by the Archdeacon, called upon Mr. Turner, the Island Curate (whose salary is £500 currency and is certainly very insufficient to keep him in anything like decency in this expensive city) to perform without any remuneration to him ALL the surplice duties for the slaves. Mr. Hill continuing to receive the emoluments for the services so performed!!!—and this was "the Bishop's view of the law"—and of his own duty as a Bishop! Mr. Turner very properly refused this very modest demand—and Mr. Hill seeks his remedy through the Clergy bill!—Will not the honourable House of Assembly disappoint his expectations, by the insertion of some such amendment as this—"in their respective districts?" If not will the Bishop dare, after the telling of this story, to let it pass the Council without such a one as will show that he is not lending himself to the oppression of a poor Curate for the convenience and advantage of a favourite?

Again—what does the Bishop mean by sanctioning, as he does, when he permits the bill to be so drawn up by his brother and Secretary, and introduced as his bill into the house with the clause so limited, the proviso which declares that no Clergyman, no, not the Bishop himself, shall visit any property for the religious instruction of the slaves on it, unless "the consent and approbation of the person in possession of the estate shall be first had and obtained?" Would it not have been more consistent with the Bishop's office, and with the desire which he ought to have to spread

religious instructions, and the usefulness of the Clergy to have left the ungodly planters, and other sticklers for "the rights of property" in human souls, themselves thus to slam to the door in the Clergyman's face? We think it would. But the Bishop is an "expedient" man, and much good may his "expedient" do him!

But here comes the clause of clauses! The Bishop and Mr. Lipscomb, intending to seek the stability of the Established Church, and to extend its usefulness, seek to have it enacted "that it shall not be lawful for any Rector or Curate, or other Minister, to perform any services of the Church or at any of the Chapels, or to visit any settlement, plantation, or estate in any parish of which he is not either the Rector, or to which he is not, for the time being duly appointed by the Governor or person exercising the functions of Governor, or licensed by the Bishop" ("O! ye sweet 'licenses' £5 6s. 8d. for each of them," quoit Harry, as he licks his lips)—"without having received the written permission for so doing of the Rector of the parish in which such Church, Chapel, settlement, plantation or estate is situate!" Well, after this, what next? The object of the clause is this—mark it well Mr. Bishop and Mr. Secretary that we know it, and shall make it known in the proper quarters—to destroy those Societies connected with the Established Church which have lent their aid to a few Christian proprietors, real members of that Church, in the ~~instruction~~ instruction of their slaves! A Christian proprietor in England requests his friend and brother here (a Clergyman in whom he has confidence) to "visit" his estate, examine and report the state of the school established upon it by that Society of the Church of England of which they are both members. But "no," says the Bishop, "you shall not, unless you will pay my brother £5 6s. 8d. for my license for doing so, or go cap in hand, to the Rector—perhaps some dancing, finding, horse-racing or boat racing parson—"and get his 'written permission for so doing!'" Well done Bishop! But think you these Christian proprietors in England, some of them possessing great influence in a certain quarter, will allow you thus to transfer their most sacred "right of property" to your unpreaching, sin-courting Rector? You deceive yourself my good Lord Bishop—depend upon it if nothing else will do it, this is an attempt which, if persisted in, will bring confusion to your whole bill. But this is not all. Just look at the insult, the gross indignity offered to the Curates by this clause! One of these could not get a brother Clergyman who may chance to visit him, to preach for, or otherwise assist him in his Chapel, without exposing both himself and his friend to the inconvenience and degradation of sending, in most cases some 15 or 20 miles to beg "the written permission for so doing of the Rector of the parish!" Really his Lordship had better at once give orders to the several Curates to provide themselves with the liveries of their respective Rectors, and constantly wear them that all men may know they are nothing more than their servants! We tell you, my Lord, to beware how you continue to permit your brother thus to sacrifice your office and your character in it, to the selfish views of individuals, and to the ungodly opposition to religion in which some of your Clergy are leagued with the planters. It is a lamentable fact that whenever one of the closed doors to instruction and the spread of religious truth is sought to be opened, your Lordship invariably pours cold water on its hinges, and covers them with "expediency."

Now, however, we meet from your Lordship with no direct assistance as in this case, at least with no obstruction, and the "expediency" of attending to the wishes and rights of really Christian proprietors, is never once thought of or suggested! These things cannot much longer be tolerated! and ere long, if there be no amendment, a solemn appeal must be made to the British Parliament to relieve the nation from the burthen of a Bishopric so little answering, through the unhappy choice made of its fiscal Bishop, the objects of its exertion, and the wishes of that nation.

Proceed we now to another clause. The Rectors are required to appoint clerks to the Churches and Chapels.—Throughout this bill there reigns the same desire of degrading and grinding the poor Curates. Why should not these have the right of appointing the clerks to their own Chapels? Why are the Rectors to have the power of annoying them by thrusting upon them, as has been done, persons they cannot agree with—improper and immoral characters? In the eagerness to bind hand and foot, and to punish the "refractory Curates," who are suspected of contributing to the Christian Record, all sight is lost of the good and peace of the Church; and of this fact, that with the "refractory," "the poor," harmless, unoffending Curates are likewise degraded and punished.

This is particularly the case in the clause which empowers the Bishop, "as often as he shall deem it EXPEDIENT and necessary," and "with the consent of the Governor," to remove upon 3 months notice "by any instrument in writing, and under his hand and seal, and duly registered," "any Curate or Minister, from any Chapel, or district of a Chapel, and to appoint him to officiate at any other Chapel and district in the same or any other parish in this island." This is about one of the most barefaced attempts in a tyrannical manner to deprive men of rights already vested in them by solemn enactment, of which we have ever heard, and the object is perfectly in keeping with its motive.—The fornicating planters of St. Thomas in the East want to get rid of Mr. Pantone, because he will preach against fornication and adultery. Mr. Bolton, the Rector of St. George's, wants to get rid of Mr. Hanna, because he has a private pique against him. Mr. Bowerbank, Rural Dean of Middlesex, and Rector of St. Catherine's, wants to get rid of Mr. Dallas, because he is both jealous of his crowded congregations, and wants a Curate for the parish who will consider himself provided and paid by the island solely and exclusively for the ease and convenience of the Rector—and for various reasons of "expediency" the Bishop wants to gratify the wants of all these gentry! To enable him to do this, his brother frames this clause depriving these Curates of their vested rights, and totally altering the nature of those appointments! Is his Lordship quite sure that supposing this power to be given him here, it will be confirmed at home? We think it a problem which remains yet to be solved. But time will show. We have not at present time to pursue the subject, but we shall watch the progress of this precious bill, and revert to it again.—But we will just remark here, that the appointments of the Island Curates are made to each particular parish, and not to the whole island generally, and that they are for life, only to be lost in the same manner, and for the same reasons as a Rector. This shows what the object of the

\* Nay, should a Clergyman in travelling, call at the house of a proprietor, his friend, it would be a question whether he must not have this "written permission for so doing!" Certainly without it he would not dare to hold family prayers, and use the occasion for dipping, a word in season to his assembled household!

Legislature was, in creating them; that object may best be furthered now by dividing our very large and extensive parishes into smaller ones, for which there is a provision of ministers already made—and not by changing these Island Curates into Rector Curates, as is now sought to be done. Again, just look at the injustice practised against the Curates here. The clause divides the parish into districts, and places the districts generally "under the immediate care of the Curate or Minister appointed" to it. The effect is this. At present the Rector is responsible for the surplice duties for the free of the whole parish, and are entitled to the fees. In a parish where there are Curates, the performance of these, the Rectors duties in their several districts is a matter of accommodation, or private arrangement between them. By this clause, the Rectors are relieved of the responsibility, whilst they continue entitled to the fees, and the performance of the duties is forced upon the Curates! who must keep their extra horses for the purpose, and hand over to the Rector the very *mile money* intended as a compensation to the minister performing the duty, for the trouble of his ride, and the expense of his horse! And this is justice! This is the way in which the Bishop exercises his influence, to protect all the classes of his Clergy! In fact the title of the bill should be altogether changed, and it should be designated as it truly is, "A bill to enable the Bishop to provide Curates for the Rectors of the several parishes of this island at the expence of the said island, and to increase Sectarian congregations, and to facilitate the increasing of Sectarian influence." We see no other end that it will answer, if it passes into a law as the Bishop has prepared it! Really, coming from a Bishop—prepared by his Secretary (*it is all in his hand writing*), it is the most extraordinary bill we ever saw, or heard of. Not one attempt is made in it to remove the obstacles that oppose themselves to the progress of the gospel. Perhaps it may be said the Bishop is aware how strong are the prejudices of the Planters upon the points of Sabbath profanation—refusing to let slaves marry without consent of owners, and thus forcing them (a common case) to live in fornication, &c. and that therefore he would not uselessly irritate them, by introducing clauses into the bill to remove these crying evils. But let us ask this question. Is not his Lordship equally aware—did not the debates of last Sessions make him equally sensible, how strong are the feelings in the House against his Registry Office and his Registrar? And yet there are clauses providing for both in this bill! no fear of exciting a useless irritation has excluded them. We leave others to draw the conclusion. One word more, and we have done. We would advise honourable members before they pass a law declaring that all the Island Curates and Ministers shall be subject here "to all the laws in force in England relating to Stipendiary Curates" to take the trouble of ascertaining what those laws are—and of somebody else than Mr. Henry Lipscomb! We would whisper to them that Bishop Lipscomb is not to be Bishop here for ever, and that after him may come one of a different kidney, and the tables will then be sadly turned.

## THE JAMAICA WATCHMAN.

religious instructions, and the usefulness of the Clergy to have left the ungodly planters, and other sticklers for "the rights of property" in human souls, themselves thus to slay to the door in the Clergyman's face? We think it would. But the Bishop is an "expedient" man, and much good may his "expediency" do him!

But here comes the clause of clauses! The Bishop and Mr. Lipscomb, intending to seek the stability of the Established Church, and to extend its usefulness, seek to have it enacted "that it shall not be lawful for any Rector or Curate, or other Minister, to perform any services of the Church or at any of the Chapels, or to visit any settlement, plantation, or estate in any parish of which he is not either the Rector, or to which he is not, for the time being duly appointed by the Governor or person exercising the functions of Governor, or licensed by the Bishop" ("O! ye sweet licenses!" £5. 6s. 8d. for each of them, quoth Harry, as he licks his lips)—"without having received the written permission for so doing of the Rector of the parish in which such Church, Chapel, settlement, plantation or estate is situated!" Well, after this, what next? The object of the clause is this—mark it well Mr. Bishop and Mr. Secretary that we know it, and shall make it known in the proper quarters—to destroy those Societies connected with the Established Church which have lent their aid to a few Christian proprietors, real members of that Church, in the religious instruction of their slaves! A Christian proprietor in England requests his friend and brother here (a Clergyman in whom he has confidence) to "visit" his estate, to examine and report the state of the school established upon it by that Society of the Church of England of which they are both members. But "no," says the Bishop; "you shall not, unless you will pay my brother £5. 6s. 8d. for my license for doing so, or go cap in hand, to the Rector—perhaps some dancing, fiddling, horse-racing or boat-racing person—'and get his written permission for so doing!'" Well done Bishop! But think you these Christian proprietors in England, some of them possessing great influence in a certain quarter, will allow you thus to transfer their most sacred "right of property" to your unpreaching, sin-concubinating Rectors? You deceive yourself my good Lord Bishop—depend upon it if nothing else will do it, this is an attempt which, if persisted in, will bring confusion to your whole bill. But this is not all. Just look at the insult, the gross indignity offered to the Curates by this clause! One of these could not get a brother Clergyman who may chance to visit him, to preach for, or otherwise assist him in his Chapel, without exposing both himself and his friend to the inconvenience and degradation of sending, in most cases some 15 or 20 miles to beg "the written permission for so doing of the Rector of the parish!"\* Really his Lordship had better at once give orders to the several Curates to provide themselves with the liveries of their respective Rectors, and constantly wear them that all men may know they are nothing more than *their* servants! We tell you, my Lord, to beware how you continue to permit your brother thus to sacrifice your office and your character in it, to the selfish views of individuals, and to the ungodly opposition to religion in which some of your Clergy are leagued with the planters. It is a lamentable fact that whenever one of the closed doors to instruction and the verad of religious truth is sought to be opened, your Lordship invariably pours cold water on its hinges, and rusts them with "expediency." But whenever an open one is to be shut, those who are closing it are sure to meet from your Lordship with no direct assistance as in this case, at least with no obstruction, and the "expediency" of attending to the wishes and rights of really Christian proprietors, is never once thought of or suggested! These things cannot much longer be tolerated! and ere long, if there be no amendment, a solemn appeal must be made to the British Parliament to relieve the nation from the burthen of a Bishopric so little answering, through the unhappy choice made of its first Bishop, the objects of its exertion, and the wishes of that nation.

Proceed we now to another clause. The Rectors are required to appoint clerks to the Churches and Chapels.—Throughout this bill there reigns the same desire of degrading and grinding the poor Curates. Why should not these have the right of appointing the clerks to their own Chapels? Why are the Rectors to have the power of annoying them by thrusting upon them, as *has been done*, persons they cannot agree with—improper and immoral characters? In the eagerness to bind hand and foot, and to punish the "refractory Curates," who are suspected of contributing to the Christian Record, all sight is lost of the good and peace of the Church; and of this fact, that with "the refractory," "the poor," harmless, unoffending Curates are likewise degraded and punished.

This is particularly the case in the clause which empowers the Bishop, "as often as he shall deem it EXPEDIENT and necessary," and "with the consent of the Governor," to remove upon 3 months notice "by any instrument in writing, and under his hand and seal, and duly registered," "any Curate or Minister, from any Chapel, or district of a Chapel, and to appoint him to officiate at any other Chapel and district in the same or *any other parish* in this island." This is about one of the most barefaced attempts in a tyrannical manner to deprive men of rights already vested in them by solemn enactment, of which we have ever heard, and the object is perfectly in keeping with its motive.—The fornicating planters of St. Thomas in the East want to get rid of Mr. Panton, because he will preach against fornication and adultery. Mr. Bolton, the Rector of St. George's, wants to get rid of Mr. Hanna, because he has a private pique against him. Mr. Bowerbank, Rural Dean of Middlesex, and Rector of St. Catherine's, wants to get rid of Mr. Dallas, because he is both jealous of his crowded congregations, and wants a Curate for the parish who will consider himself provided and paid by the island solely and exclusively for the ease and convenience of the Rector—and for various reasons of "expediency" the Bishop wants to gratify the wants of all these gentry! To enable him to do this, his brother frames this clause depriving these Curates of their vested rights, and totally altering the nature of those appointments! Is his Lordship quite sure that supposing this power to be given him here, it will be confirmed at home? We think it a problem which remains yet to be solved. But time will show. We have not at present time to pursue the subject, but we shall watch the progress of this precious bill, and revert to it again.—But we will just remark here, that the appointments of the Island Curates are made to each particular parish, and not to the whole island generally, and that they are for life, only to be lost in the same manner, and for the same reasons as a Rectory. This shows what the object of the

Legislature was, in creating them: that object may best be furthered now by dividing our very large and extensive parishes into smaller ones, for which there is a provision of ministers already made—and not by changing these Island Curates into *Rector's Curates*, as is now sought to be done. Again, just look at the injustice practised against the Curates here. The clause divides the parish into districts, and places the districts generally "under the immediate care of the Curate or Minister appointed" to it. The effect of this. At present the Rector is responsible for the surplice duties for the free of the whole parish, and are entitled to the fees. In a parish where there are Curates, the performance of these, the Rectors duties in their several districts is a matter of accommodation, or private arrangement between them. By this clause, the Rectors are relieved of the responsibility, whilst they continue entitled to the fees, and the performance of the duties is forced upon the Curates, who must keep their extra horses for the purpose, and hand over to the Rector the *very mile money* intended as a compensation to the minister performing the duty, for the trouble of his ride, and the expence of his horse! And this is justice? This is the way in which the Bishop exercises his influence, to protect all the classes of his Clergy? In fact the title of the bill should be altogether changed, and it should be designated as it truly is, "A bill to enable the Bishop to provide Curates for the Rectors of the several parishes of this island at the expence of the said island, and to increase Sectarian congregations, and to facilitate the increasing of Sectarian influence." We see no other end that it will answer, if it passes into a law *as the Bishop has prepared it!* Really, coming from a Bishop—prepared by his Secretary (*if it is all in his hand writing*), it is the most extraordinary bill we ever saw, or heard of. Not one attempt is made in it to remove the obstacles that oppose themselves to the progress of the gospel. Perhaps it may be said the Bishop is aware how strong are the prejudices of the Planters upon the points of Sabbath profanation—refusing to let slaves marry without consent of owners, and thus forcing them (a common case) to live in fornication, &c. and that therefore he would not uselessly irritate them, by introducing clauses into the bill to remove these crying evils. But let us ask this question. Is not his Lordship equally aware—did not the debates of last Sessions make him equally sensible, how strong are the feelings in the House against his Registry Office and his Registrar? And yet there are clauses providing for both in this bill! no fear of exciting a useless irritation has excluded them. We leave others to draw the conclusion. One word more, and we have done. We would advise honorable members before they pass a law declaring that all the Island Curates and Ministers shall be subject here "to all the laws in force in England relating to Stipendiary Curates" to take the trouble of ascertaining what those laws are—and of somebody else than Mr. Henry Lipscomb! We would whisper to them that Bishop Lipscomb is not to be Bishop here for ever, and that after him may come one of a different kidney, and the tables will then be sadly turned.

Rec Jan 27/33.

### THE CLERGY BILL

We have been favoured with a sight of this bill, and a precious sample it is of the politics of Bishop Lipscomb, and of the trickery of his lawyer brother Mr. Henry! We have seen some queer things enacted into laws by our Jamaica Legislature certainly, but if this same bill of Mr. Henry Lipscomb shall pass the ordeal of its three branches, we shall then be indebted to it for about the most complete specimen of lying and partial legislation that can well be conceived. The bill professes, by its preamble, to seek the stability of the Established Church in this island, and to extend its usefulness among us; in doing which it is to provide for the better government of the Clergy, and for investing the Bishop with ecclesiastical authority over them. But what does it? 1st. It shakes that Church to its foundation; for once effect that all the people of God shall be driven from its communion, as by some of the tyrannical and soul-fettering clauses of this bill they are likely to be, and the example of the Papacy may teach us the result. 2d. It subdivides the trammels and meshes of Mr. Lipscomb's restrictions and beloved £5. 6s. 8d. licenses, the exceptions of the few Ministers of the Established Church among us who care for the souls of the people, and do not count the "care of souls" simply as a temporal benefit, a "doing well to themselves"—that their usefulness, already shamefully circumscribed and limited, is altogether put an end to. 3d. Instead of providing an ecclesiastical code of regulations for the government of the Clergy, and investing the Bishop with ecclesiastical authority, it flies in the face of the Canons and Constitutions of the Church, and does nothing more nor less than make the Bishop (according as we have heard, to his own favourite simile, when talking of his authority) the colonel of a regiment, in which his Archdeacon, Rural Deans, and Chaplain are the field officers, the Rectors, captains and lieutenants, and the poor Curates (Island and Stipendiary,) sergeants, corporals, and lance corporals, amenable to regimental courts martial, to be degraded and turned into the ranks whenever they shall offend against the discipline of the regiment, or the whims of "their superior officers!" Such is Mr. Henry Lipscomb's bill—a bill which has, of course, been submitted to the Bishop for his approval before its introduction into the House! Reverend Father in God! what are we to say to you? What, think you, will be said to you for this bill in England! in the Colonial Office! in the House of Commons? But we need not go so far surely—what will not be said to you in our own House of Assembly, upon such propositions as are contained in the following clauses!—clauses which you have authorized, or at least permitted your lawyer brother to frame in "the Bishop's bill?"

The first clause we notice is that requiring the Curates to assist the Rectors, not only in the propagation of the Gospel, but "in the performance of all other ministerial duties amongst the slaves." Does his Lordship, or his brother, mean to confine this assistance to the districts of such Curates? Or is this clause intended, as we have heard, to meet the following case, and one or two others like it? It is well known that the Archdeacon of Jamaica has been made to take the living of Kingston, and that one of the Stipendiary Curates, intended, when provided for by the British Parliament for the instruction of the slaves) has been given to him to perform his duties of Rector. Mr. Hill, the Bishop's Chaplain and prime minister, is this Curate, and receives, in addition to his Stipend from the Treasury, a very handsome remuneration for his performance of the Rector's surplice duties—(the emoluments of his two appointments, together, we have heard exceed £1,000 per annum)—but these duties somewhat interfere with his dancing attendances upon the Bishop and the Bishop's lady! To remove this inconvenience, sometime back, Mr. Hill, aided by the Bishop, and through him, by the Archdeacon, called upon Mr. Turner, the Island Curate (whose salary is £500 currency and is certainly very insufficient to keep him in any thing like decency in this expensive city) to perform *without any remuneration to him ALL* the surplice duties for the slaves. Mr. Hill continuing to receive the emoluments for the services so performed!!!—and this was "the Bishop's view of the law"—and of his own duty as a Bishop! Mr. Turner very properly refused this very modest demand—and Mr. Hill seeks his remedy through the Clergy bill!—Will not the honourable House of Assembly disappoint his expectations, by the insertion of some such amendment as this—"in their respective districts?" If not will the Bishop dare, after the telling of this story, to let it pass the Council without such a one as will show that he is not lending himself to the oppression of a poor Curate for the convenience and advantage of a favourite?

Again—what does the Bishop mean by sanctioning, as he does, when he permits the bill to be so drawn up by his brother and Secretary, and introduced as his bill into the house with the clause so limited, the proviso which declares that no Clergyman, no, not the Bishop himself, shall visit any property for the religious instruction of the slaves on it, unless "the consent and approbation of the person in possession of the estate shall be first had and obtained?" Would it not have been more consistent with the Bishop's office, and with the desire which he ought to have to spread

\* Nay, should a Clergyman in travelling, call at the house of a proprietor, his friend, it would be question whether he must not have this "written permission for so doing!" Certainly without it he would not dare to hold family prayers, and use the occasion for dropping "a word in season" to his assembled household!

## CLERICAL JOBBING.

C 0 b - 1573

His Lordship is merely our kind Agent to expend our money.

*Evidence of the Rev. J. T. Barrett, D. D. before the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the extinction of slavery. Qr. 8,316, p. 352.*

Never was there a truer description given of the "uses and occupation" of Christopher Lipscomb, Lord Bishop of Jamaica, than that which we have extracted above from the testimony of the Reverend "Secretary to the Society for the conversion and religious instruction of the negro population." His Lordship is, indeed, "MERELY" an Agent for the expenditure of money! Dr. Barrett says, he is a "kind" one; and as far as the money belongs to the Doctor, and the Conversion Society, if they desire its being squandered, and feel an obligation to the squanderer, we have nothing to object to any sentiments of gratitude they may entertain and express for his *kindness*. There are, however, other parties besides Dr. Barrett, and the "Corporate Body" (vide, his answer to Qr. 8,332,) who are interested in the matter, whose the money really is, and who, before they acknowledge the *kindness* of their Agent, will first we think require to be satisfied, that the money of theirs "placed at his disposal" has been expended with a due regard to the objects for which it has been so placed. These parties are, 1st. the benevolent individuals who have bestowed their money on the "Conversion and other Societies—not that it may be regarded as the property of the managing individuals of those societies, and to afford them a source of self congratulation in its expenditure, unconnected with the attainment of its legitimate object, but IN TRUST, for the actual promotion of God's glory, and their fellow creature's good. At least to be honestly applied by them in such ways, as may most promise to be conducive to those results, and therefore to be jealously watched over in its expenditure, and accounted for. 2dly. The parties for whose benefit the money is intended by the donors, and 3dly. The whole British Nation, the great proprietor, and guardian of every charitable fund, established for the benefit of the whole, or of any portion of that nation. Now, before these parties, especially the last, join Dr. Barrett in his sentiments of the *kindness* of Bishop Lipscomb's Agency in the expenditure of their money, we think they will certainly require some better account to be given of it, than the "particularly bald" report, as the Rev. Secretary somewhat quaintly, but *honestly* characterizes it, which is at present furnished. How this indeed is to be obtained we cannot say, the best Macassar oil will not make hair grow, where no hair is; but the following facts, which have come to our knowledge, will throw a light upon the general mode in which this kind agency for expending money is carried on by the Bishop, which may help the parties interested in discovering whether their funds are or are not applied to the purposes they intended.

When Jamaica was erected into a See, and Dr. Lipscomb was consecrated its first Bishop, £10,000 a.g. per annum was voted by the British Parliament, to be thus appropriated:—To the Bishop, £4000; to his Archdeacon, appointed to assist him in superintending the Diocese, £2000; and the remainder in salaryng 6 Stipendiary Ministers to be employed, with an especial regard to the spiritual wants of the slave population, in those parts of our extensive parishes, equal in size to some Counties in England, where no provision had yet been made for them!—Further, to aid in extending the means of religious instruction among the slaves, the Society for their "conversion and religious instruction," placed at his disposal £1000 sterling, per annum more! Keeping these particulars in mind, let the parties concerned, weigh well the facts.

**Fact No. 1.**—Instead of assisting the Bishop in superintending the Ecclesiastical affairs of the Diocese, the Archdeacon has been made the Rector of Kingston—but of course on an understanding that he is still to receive his £2000 sterling, per annum; and is not to be called upon to sink the dignity of an Archdeacon, in performing the usual duties of a Rector; a Curate must be found him!—Accordingly

**Fact No. 2.**—Is, that one of the six Stipendiary Ministers, provided and stipended by the British Government for the instruction of the slaves, HAS BEEN TAKEN FROM THAT WORK, and appointed to officiate as Rector's Curate in Kingston! This Curate receives an additional salary out of the proceeds of the living—the surplus being "placed at the Bishop's disposal" for the general purposes of the Diocese. Now, it is "kindly" expected we shall see presently—but to complete the particulars of that second fact; so entirely are the claims of the slaves upon the ministration of this Clergyman, of whom this arrangement deprives them, set aside by the Bishop, that although he receives two salaries, one as we have shown specifically for the performance of clerical duties among the slaves, and the other for the same duties, concurrently with the other duties of the Rector of Kingston, an attempt has recently been made to relieve him altogether from them, and to force them as an additional task upon the single and very inadequately salaried Island Curate!

**Fact No. 3.**—To perform the duties of the Archdeacon—Mr. Pope following the example of Dr. Lipscomb, and sitting down quietly at home! a new grade in the Church (one, totally unknown to its constitution) has been created, under the delusive title of "Rural Dean." We say delusive title, because the office of Rural Dean, which is known to the Church of England, is totally different to that which is sought to be established in the Church here, the progeny of Dr. Lipscomb's and Mr. Pope's peculiar attachment to their own ease! The difference between the two offices we may point out upon a future occasion, and elucidate by some amusing instances of the assumption by our Rural Deans of Ecclesiastical power and authority, but this is not our subject at present. Three of these Dignitaries, one for each county, have been appointed at a salary of £140 per annum each, to do the duties belonging to the offices of Bishop and Archdeacon! These Rural Deans are, the Rector of St. Andrew's, the Rector of St. Catherine's, and the Rector of St. James's. In performing their duties as such Rural Deans, these Rectors must and do neglect and abandon their own parishes, for a very considerable period of the year; the Rector of St. Catherine's, as Rural Dean of Middlesex, has been absent from his three months at a time, and doing what? Taking his pleasure in the country—or still worse, "Rural-deaning it with his bookkeeper, catechists and parrot eatechumen!" None of the Rectors themselves employ Curates, but (pursuing the system thus introduced by Dr. Lipscomb, of every man's duty being performed by somebody else,) whilst they are doing, or rather "making-believe" to do the Bishop's and the Archdeacon's, either shuffle off their own "cure of souls" upon any chance brother who may fall in their way, and who, nine times out of ten, must be neglecting his own cure, whilst taking care of theirs; or, as is shown by

**Fact No. 4.**—The people, and especially the slaves, are robbed of the ministrations of another Clergyman, who might be carefully employed in one or other of the innumerable desert places around us, and his services are "kindly" bestowed upon the Rural-deaning Rector! For upwards of four years the Rector of St. Catherine's was accommodated, without his being put to a shilling of expence, with an Island Curate to do his duties for him! And when this arrangement was interrupted—how we may tell another time—what then did "our kind agent for the expenditure of our money?" Why, he has most "kindly" taken out of the funds "placed at his disposal" £500 per annum to salary a Curate especially and solely for the performance of the duties of the Rector of St. Catherine's!!! At the same time the Island Curate, through the opposition of the Rector and his friends, connived at, if not assisted by the Bishop, is kept without a Chapel, and debarred from ministering among the slaves! Thus not only are the slaves of the island generally robbed of the £500 a-year given to the Rector of St. Catherine's for his Curate, but are prevented from reaping the benefit which was intended for them by the Legislature, at least in the appointment of their Island Curate! Our limits preclude our pursuing this subject further for the present, but we must just put one more fact on record:—It is

**Fact No. 5.**—All this time, while Dr. Lipscomb is thus providing so kindly out of the funds "placed at his disposal" Curates for those who ought to be made to provide them for themselves, or to do their own duties, there are some dozen stations in the island either totally unprovided with Clergymen, or from their being only one to take charge of several, only served by one occasionally, and at intervals "few and far between."

Now, with these facts before him, what will Dr. Barrett think of his "kind agent?" Will he not require of him "a better account?" If he does not, we know who will, and we advise Dr. Lipscomb to be prepared to furnish it, when "CALLED FOR BY THE HOUSE OF COMMONS!"—More anon.

## Correspondence.

### TO THE EDITOR OF THE WATCHMAN.

SIR,

One of our poor unfortunate black brethren has applied to me for advice under the following circumstance; and as he wishes to take your opinion as to the *acts of justice* done here, I beg leave, through your paper (the poor man's friend,) to make the circumstance known. Accidents will happen in the best regulated families they say; and you must know one happened at Port Maria on a certain night between this unfortunate man and another, which latter was the defendant. Be pleased to bear in mind that the said defendant was *cold*, as the word goes, and fined in the sum of Ten Pounds, with costs, as is always the case. Subsequently the following bill was banded to the PLAINTIFF:—

"Mr. J. M. B.

1833 To the Clerk of the Peace Dr.

April, The King vs. Francis, for an assault on	£.	s.	d.
you, making out affidavit, warrant, and			
recognizance.....	3	16	8
Seizing Indictment to Grand Jury.....	2	13	4
Indictment returned, "true bill.".....	0	12	6

Credit.....

Fee on the continuance of traverse from

January to April .....

Be it understood, Mr. Editor, that the payment of £1. 6s. 8d. was not "on account," but in advance. You may see through this trick without any comment from me, but lawyer "Latitat" says, a payment on account is an admission of the debt. But again, Lawyer Blackstone says "extortion" is an abuse of public justice, "which consists in any officer's taking unlawfully, by colour of his office, from any man, any money or thing in value that is not due to him, or more than is due, or before it is due. The punishment is fine and imprisonment, and sometimes a forfeiture of the office." But I may be allowed to say that not only are *plaintiffs* and *defendants* saddled with costs, but the Clerk of the Peace has the bare-face to demand a conviction fee besides of £5. Now I find, on enquiring, that the defendant is only saddled with the costs which will amount to £2 7s. 6d !!! out of which, had the *plaintiff* a right to pay it, deducting the pistole, a paltry balance of 20 shillings and 10d. is due; and for which the Clerk of the Peace, in his peaceable vocation, sends an action in his brother's name, and signs himself "John Harris, Clerk Court." Here's a go for you —ye knowing Unions! By virtue of which Clerk of the Courtship, the said *plaintiff* now becomes a *defendant*, and is bilked out of the sum of £3 17s. 6d. and for what? Why for being well drubb'd, and for seeking justice!!

How, in the name of law, justice, or reason can the Clerk of the Peace demand one pistole for the condemnation certificate of a convicted negro, when that pistole is included in the whole sum allowed by law to him for every negro prosecution, namely five pounds! And really, Sir, is it not disgusting to see a Clerk of the Peace, *prosecutor* of slaves, by virtue of his office in Saint Mary, and at the same time *defender* of slaves in Saint Ann, where he is a non-resident, knows nothing of, and bears nothing from, the unfortunate slaves, except when he goes to the parish, one day before the slave court commences? James Harris is *defender* of slaves here, and *deputy* Clerk of the Peace in St. Ann's, he is also a non-resident here, and knows nothing of the condition of the slaves. Well might Mr. Stanley say, that the defenders of slaves "are chosen from among themselves," the Unionists, their undeniably persecutors—and so says

QUAMINE.

Crabhole Corner, Port Maria.

### "4th—COMPULSORY MANUMISSION."

#### MR. STANLEY'S SPEECH, HOUSE OF COMMONS.

This is quite unnecessary, as the proprietor who would refuse to concede manumission to a slave who could pay for it, would be compelled to do so by the local magistracy.—*Note by the Editor of the Courant.*

July

SIR.—I am acquainted with a slave in this parish, who has the means of paying for himself, and would have done so long ago, had he not been led to believe that his manumission could not be procured in any way but with his master's consent (which has been most positively refused.) I confess I was under the same impression until I saw the above assertion in the Courant, and knowing your scrupulous regard for truth, and that nothing false is ever allowed to stain the columns of that paper, I have placed implicit confidence in it, and have no doubt, that with your assistance the person in question will be able to gain the object he has in view. The fact is that now you have informed him that the Magistracy will compel his owner to manumise him, it only remains for you to point out the course he ought to pursue before they will take cognizance of the matter. I trust you will not withhold this information.

July

By the bye, I suppose Mr. Beaumont must have been as ignorant as myself of this law, or he would not have lost his popularity by pressing his Compensation Manumission Bill last Sessions and the one before. It is a pity you did not shew it to him, it would have saved many angry discussions in the House of Assembly, but perhaps you have only lately discovered it yourself, do let me know where it is to be found, and oblige

Your most obedient servant,

INQUIRER.

Observatory, Clarendon Mountain.

War-Office, Feb. 25, 1833.

## SHIPPING INTELLIGENCE.

—ooo—

## ARRIVED AT PORT-ROYAL.

July 20 Ship Tulloch Castle, Rayner	Old Harbour, to fill up, to Messrs. Yates & Cockburn
Brig Henry, —	Cork, 45 days, provisions, to Messrs. Elin, Scott, & Co.
21 Sch. Mandeville, Freeman	San Blas, 5 days, general cargo, to John Mais, Esq.
— India, Gomes	Put back to refit, having sprung a leak

## SAILED FROM PORT-ROYAL.

July 21 H.M.P.B. Goldfinch, Lieut. Collier	Carthagena
Brig Lagan, Murphy	Cork
— Sir P. Maitland, King	Halifax
— Trafalgar, Sawyer	Charleston
Sch. Lady Smith, Cooke	Nassau, N.P.
— India, Gomes	Carthagena
22 Barque George Canning, Cousens	Black River
Brig Eagle, Burrough	Cuba
23 Barque David Morrice, Wright	Liverpool

*Letter Bags at the Commercial Buildings.*

Countess of Mulgrave, for New York—will sail to-morrow.  
Rocket for Liverpool—will sail on Saturday.

## BIRTH.

In this City, on the 22d instant, the wife of Mr. Gonville of a daughter.

## MARRIED.

In this City, on Saturday evening last, by Special Licence, by the Rev. G. D. Hill, Edward F. Bayly, Esq. of his Majesty's Ordnance Department, to Esther, youngest daughter of the late Isaac G. Mesquita, Esq.

## DIED.

At Wettenhall, in the Nantwich Circuit, on the 9th of May, of a typhus fever, Hannah, the wife of Joseph Wood, sen. and mother of the Rev. William Wood, of St. Ann's, Jamaica.

At Liverpool, on the 8th ultimo the wife of Caleb M. Littlejohn, Esq. of the Parish of St. Andrew, in this Island.

In this City, on Sunday, after a short illness, Master William M'Neal, eldest son of Mr. James W. Dick, aged 7 years and 6 months. He was an intelligent and affectionate child, and his loss is deeply regretted by his parents.—Early on Monday morning at his residence in High Holborn-Street, after several days of severe illness, Mr. George P. Want, leaving a disconsolate widow and four children to lament his irreparable loss and premature departure from his transitory life. Mr. Want, by a long and persevering course of honest industry, combined with rectitude of principle, a due regard to, and performance of, the several duties of a husband, father, and friend, had gained the esteem, not only of his more immediate circle of respectable friends and acquaintances, but even of those who "move in the higher walks of life." His remains were most numerously and respectfully attended to the place where all worldly care ceases, and there deposited, amidst the tears and sobs of many of his old friends and fellow-citizens.

\* The superstitions of the commonality believe the night-shrike of this bird, as he flies through the air, to be ominous of imminent death.